

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
*See* Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

SEP 12 2012

COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
STATE OF ARIZONA  
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,	)	2 CA-CR 2012-0091
	)	DEPARTMENT B
Appellee,	)	
	)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.	)	Not for Publication
	)	Rule 111, Rules of
LUIS CARLOS DORAME-RUIZ,	)	the Supreme Court
	)	
Appellant.	)	
_____	)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF GILA COUNTY

Cause No. CR201000636

Honorable Peter J. Cahill, Judge

AFFIRMED

Emily Danies

Tucson  
Attorney for Appellant

ESPINOSA, Judge.

¶1 After a jury trial, appellant Luis Dorame-Ruiz was convicted of second-degree trafficking in stolen property and false reporting to a law enforcement officer. He was sentenced to a 6.5-year prison term for trafficking in stolen property and a concurrent 180-day jail term for false reporting. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999), stating she “has reviewed the record” but has found “[n]o arguable question of

law” to raise on appeal and asking this court to review the record for fundamental error. Dorame-Ruiz has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 We view the evidence in the light most favorable to sustaining the verdicts. *State v. Tamplin*, 195 Ariz. 246, ¶ 2, 986 P.2d 914, 914 (App. 1999). The evidence presented at trial showed that Dorame-Ruiz transferred stolen property—a compound bow and a recurve bow—to another, knowing the bows had been stolen, and that he misled a police officer who was investigating the theft of the bows. We conclude the evidence was sufficient to support the jury’s verdicts. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-2301(B), 13-2307(A), 13-2907.01(A).

¶3 Further, Dorame-Ruiz’s sentences were within the prescribed statutory range and were imposed lawfully. *See* A.R.S. §§ 13-703(B), (I), 13-707(A)(1), 13-708(A), 13-2307(C), 13-2907.01(B). Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for fundamental, reversible error and have found none. *See State v. Fuller*, 143 Ariz. 571, 575, 694 P.2d 1185, 1189 (1985) (*Anders* requires court to search record for fundamental error). Accordingly, Dorame-Ruiz’s convictions and sentences are affirmed.

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa  
PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ Garye L. Vásquez  
GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Presiding Judge

/s/ Virginia C. Kelly  
VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge